

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for discussing this matter on the telephone and for entering an Examiner's amendment on October 11, 2007. Specifically the Examiner's amendment changes the last clause of claim 21 to state "the device has a diameter of more than 370 mm". This change is incorporated into the listing of claims herein and claim 21 is provided with a status of "Previously Presented". Applicant appreciates and acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claims 33-42 and 47-49.

Claim 29 has been amended herein to depend from a claim that has not been cancelled.

Claims 21-27, 30-32 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,417,894 to Goff (hereinafter Goff). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Claim 21 was previously amended to include all of the features of claim 28, which depended from claim 21, claim 28 previously being indicated as allowable over Goff. Specifically, Goff does not disclose a device for observing a display screen, wherein the device has a diameter of more than 370mm.

Claims 22-27, 30-32 and 46 depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reason stated above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-27, 30-32 and 46 is respectfully requested.

Claims 43 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goff in view of U.S. Patent 7,088,508 to Ebina et al. (hereinafter Ebina). For the following reasons the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Claims 43 and 44 depend indirectly from claim 21. As previously stated above, Goff does not disclose a device for observing a display screen, wherein the device has a diameter of more than 370mm. Ebina also does not disclose such a device. Thus, even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, all of the features of claims 43 and 44 would not be taught or suggested.

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 43 and 44.

Claims 45 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goff in view of U.S. Patent 6,086,228 to McGowan et al. (hereinafter McGowan). For the following reasons the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Claim 45 depends indirectly from claim 21. As previously stated above, Goff does not disclose a device for observing a display screen, wherein the device has a diameter of more than 370mm. McGowan also does not disclose such a device. Thus, even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, all of the features of claim 45 would not be taught or suggested.

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 45.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. FRG-16146.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700